DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 921 24 SP 003 958

AUTHOR	Bauch, Jerold P.
TITLE	PM Evaluation Guidelines.
INSTITUTION	Georgia Univ., Athens. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
REPORT NO	GEM-Bull-69-13
BUREAU NO	BR-8-9024
PUB DATE	69
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-089024-311(010)
NOTE	9p.; Phase 1, Elementary Teacher Education Model
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.55
DESCRIPTORS	Individualized Instruction, *Models, *Student Evaluation, *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models

ABSTRACT

This paper presents guidelines for the evaluation of candidate performance, the basic function of the evaluation component of the Georgia program model for the preparation of elementary school teachers. The three steps in the evaluation procedure are outlined: (1) proficiency module (PM) entry appraisal (pretest); (2) self evaluation and the recording of activities; and (3) PM exit appraisal (posttest). Six basic suggestions for the individual or group developing the PM are listed. They deal with PM prerequisites; appropriate variety, emphasis, and balance among type of evaluation procedures; use of a learning task check list, a means for the candidate to keep records of activities and for the advisor or PM coordinator to verify them; use of goal cards, another vehicle for student self evaluation and advisor verification; and what entry assessment and exit assessment should determine. (JS)

ED040921

GEORGIA EDUCATIONAL MODELS
The University of Georgia
College of Education
Athens, Georgia 30601

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PM Evaluation Guidelines

GEM Bulletin 69-13

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS ~~COPYRIGHTED~~ MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Charles L. Johnson
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE ~~COPYRIGHT~~ OWNER."

Jerold P. Bauch

1969

Note: This bulletin reports one of a series of investigations designed to develop, evaluate and implement a model teacher education program for the preparation of elementary teachers. This report was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy. This bulletin may not be reproduced without permission.

SP003958

Introduction

The evaluation of candidate performance is the basic function of the evaluation component of the program model. In general, this procedure consists of proficiency module (PM) entry appraisal (pretest), self-evaluation and the recording of activities, and PM exit appraisal (Posttest). The specific procedures are enumerated in the following description.

Procedures

The basic development of the entry appraisal and exit appraisal is the responsibility of the individual or group developing the PM. Suggestions and guidelines for this development are included in this paper. The PM developers will determine minimum levels of performance and levels of performance necessary for exempting the PM, or any part of it.

Each PM development team will have an evaluation technical assistant available for specialized assistance in developing evaluation devices and procedures. Through this specialist, additional technical consultants such as computer specialists and video tape technicians may be called to work with the team. The evaluation technical assistant supports the PM development team and provides

competency in measurement techniques, determining reliability and validity, item analysis, and other specialized areas. The job description for this specialist is found on page 37 of Volume III of the feasibility study (Johnson, et al, 1970).

Guidelines

1. State the prerequisites and other conditions which must be met before the candidate is eligible to begin the PM.
2. The appropriate variety, emphasis, and balance among type of evaluation procedure can be predetermined by using a table of specifications (Payne, 1968). Since the specifications have in most cases been developed according to the taxonomies (Bloom, 1958 and Krathwhol, 1964) this task has been partially accomplished. A list of 13 types of evaluation procedures is also attached.
3. The learning tasks check list (Figure 1) is a means for the candidate to keep records of activities, for the advisor or PM coordinator to verify these activities, and for comments to be made. The selected tasks column might be

Learning Task Check List							
Selected Tasks (from PM)	To be completed by candidate		To be completed by advisor or PM coordinator				
	Date accomplished	Time spent	Date verified	S	U	Comments	
1. Read Michaelis, J. U. Social.....							
2. View Filmstrip Using Color.....							
Additional or alternate tasks							
1.							
2.							
3.							

Fig. 1. Sample learning task check list.

completed by the advisor, the student, or both. This check list will eventually be printed on multi-copy forms so that the student keeps one, the advisor keeps one, and a third is submitted for data processing and storage.

4. Goal cards (Bauernfeind, 1966) are another vehicle for student self-evaluation and verification by the advisor or PM coordinator. The sample Goal Card (Figure 2) is similar to those developed by Bauernfeind and can easily be modified to reflect the specifications in a particular PM.

5. The entry assessment should determine:

    a. If the candidate has the prerequisite background essential for successful completion of PM tasks

    b. The number and quality of supporting behaviors the candidate can perform before engaging in PM learning tasks

    c. The performance area and level on the stated PM objectives

6. The exit assessment should determine:

    a. The number and quality of supporting behaviors the candidate can perform

Date

Student's Name			PM Number		
Student's Rating			Advisor's Verification		
S	U		U	S	Exceptional Ability
____	____	1. Can describe and discuss.....	____	____	____
____	____	2. Can state.....	____	____	____
____	____	3. Can describe and discuss.....	____	____	____
____	____	4. Can recognize...	____	____	____
		5. Can explain.....	____	____	____
			____	____	____
			____	____	____
			____	____	____
			____	____	____
		6. Can write.....	____	____	____
		7. Can construct...	____	____	____
		8. Can identify....	____	____	____
		9.	____	____	____
		10.	____	____	____
		11.	____	____	____
		12.	____	____	____
		13. Can recognize...	____	____	____
		14.	____	____	____
		15.	____	____	____

Fig. 2. Sample goal card

b. The performance area and level on the stated PM objectives

Typical Sequence of Events

In a typical PM, the events associated with the evaluation of student performance will follow a generalized sequence such as the one below:

1. entry appraisal (following determination by advisor of eligibility to begin this PM)
2. determination of need to engage in PM (or to attempt exit appraisal and be credited for competency in this PM, or to recycle or route to clinic)
3. engage in PM activities
4. begin task check list
5. begin goal card
6. complete PM activities
7. complete task check list or verify
8. complete goal card or verify
9. exit appraisal
10. determination of eligibility to proceed to next PM or recycling or clinic
11. storage of entry and exit appraisal data, task check list data, and candidate evaluation and reaction data.

Individual periodic and accumulative evaluation include those procedures for the candidate and/or the advisor to retrieve information on the overall progress of the candidate. A print-out of the candidate's progress can be requested at any given time by the candidate or advisor.

Group evaluation procedures include retrieval of data on candidates by groups according to specific characteristics. This retrieval will be done by advisors when conferring with individual candidates and be used for comparative purposes. PM development groups can also retrieve such information on particular PMs or PM groups. For instance, the average length of time to complete a particular PM sequence might be retrieved to aid in revision of that sequence. Or average scores on particular PMs by type of student (e.g. older or younger, native or foreign, man or woman, transfer or not, etc.) might be used in conferring with a student.

Determining the Cost

PM development teams can determine the costs associated with the development of PM evaluation procedures by applying the formulas from GEM Bulletin 69-7 (Payne, 1969). This forecast of costs will be useful in making decisions with regard to types of evaluation procedures selected.

References

Bauernfeind, R. H. Goal cards and future development in achievement test. Proceedings of the 1965 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1966.

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.) Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York: David McKay Company, 1956.

Johnson, C. E. and Shearron, Gilbert F. (editors) The feasibility of the Georgia educational model for teacher preparation--elementary, Volume III: Job descriptions. Washington, D. C.: US Dept. HEW, Office of Education, Project No. 9-0477, Contract No. OEC-0-9-200477-4043, Jan. 1970.

Krathwohl, D. R., et al. Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook II: Affective domain. New York: David McKay Company, 1964.

Payne, D. A. Estimating costs for development of candidate performance evaluation procedures. GEM Bulletin 69-7, Athens, Ga.: College of Education, University of Ga., 1969.

Payne, D. A. The specification and measurement of learning outcomes. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1968.